

REMARKS

This is in further response to the Examiner's action dated February 28, 2006.

Claims 12-14 have been added by the present amendment. Claim 12 differs from claim 1 only by omission of the recitation that the base supports the case and by the addition of the recitation that the base has a plurality of feet. Each of claims 13 and 14 specifies that the case has a plurality of feet.

Support for these recitations will be found in paragraph [0030] of the specification.

Clearly, the applied reference does not disclose these features.

In view of the foregoing, and in view of the agreement reached during the personal interview with the Examiner, it is requested that the present amendment be entered, that claims 1-14 be allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.

Appln. No. 10/780,733


Amd. dated June 28, 2006

Reply to Office Action of February 28, 2006

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:nlw

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\S\seb\Houel 2\PTO\2006-06-05-amendment.doc